

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 16, 1999 LB 179

Governor's budget provide for all other A bills? Zero, absolutely zero. That means that if the Governor followed his current philosophy and you pass this at 9 million, he may well...he may well sign it. But if he's following his current philosophy, he will reject each and every A bill that is forthcoming thereafter. That's what his budget provided. So we should understand that at least. You've already adopted now about three and a...Senator Wickersham says three, the figures I got say three and a half, it's somewhere in that neighborhood. You've adopted that now. You've done something very significant for homestead exemption. And don't forget there's an inflation factor on this, it's in statute, on the eligibility provision that you have just increased now. Every year, that's going to increase for inflation, so it's going to go up every year also. So I'd ask you to look at it again and consider whether or not it might not make more sense to amend it out now temporarily, and if you get on Final Reading and we have to make an adjustment by amendment, doesn't it make more sense to amend it up at that point in time, if you see we have money, although I predict you will not see that, but at least that gives you...the option is still there. But take the conservative approach. Take the cautious approach and then, if we have more money in the end and you don't want to put...or you don't want to put any more money in a rainy day fund, you can do that. But I hope we will not put ourselves in the position of simply relying upon the Governor to override everything, all of us knowing that we presented him with a budget that's too large. First of all, that makes us look irresponsible as an institution, and I think historically has been one of our...one of our problems. Secondly, when you vote to override the Governor, there's an inherent kind of problem there, I think, for each and every one of us politically. Because if we've voted for something in the first instance, logically and philosophically we should vote for it on the override. And if you choose to cut spending by not...by not overriding, you, in effect, start to put yourself in the ambiguous position with your constituents of having voted for something in one instance and against it in another...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...and never having considered the bulk of your spending as a whole. I'm hopeful that we can get to the